

Interview Summary

Application No.
08/978,235

Applicant(s)

Mass et al.

Examiner

Cheryl Juska

Group Art Unit

1771

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Cheryl Juska

(3) Ex. Christopher Raimund

(2) Michael Marcus *MSN*

(4) William Sekyi

Date of Interview Jan 19, 2000

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☒ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☒ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-4 and 9

Identification of prior art discussed:

Leiber (US 5,256,353)

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

We agreed to withdraw the new matter objection to Amendment A, as set forth in section 3 of the last Office Action, regarding the terms "shuss" and "franze," upon submittal of a new amendment which will clarify the claimed terminology. Based upon the drawings and the cited prior art, it is understood that the term "schuss/shuss" is equivalent to "lateral/transverse," and the term "franse/franze" is equivalent to "longitudinal." We also discussed claims 2-4 with regard to the objection the specification and the 112, 2nd rejections. We agreed to discuss these issues by telephone after Marcus consulted with the inventors. Additionally, we discussed the 102 rejections and possible methods of overcoming said rejections. We finally agreed that the best route was to submit a declaration comparing samples of the cited Leiber patent and the presently claimed invention, with particular attention being paid to the actual and calculated ribbon lengths of the two inventions.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.